



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,758	06/23/2006	Noriyoshi Matsuura	JP030024	1207
24737 7590 12/16/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER HEYMAN, JOHN S				
ART UNIT 2871		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 12/16/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,758

Applicant(s)

MATSUURA, NORIYOSHI

Examiner

JOHN HEYMAN

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references cited in the Search Report 06/23/2006 have been considered, but will not be listed on any patent resulting from this application because they were not provided on a separate list in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). In order to have the references printed on such resulting patent, a separate listing, preferably on a PTO/SB/08A and 08B form, must be filed within the set period for reply to this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osada et al. (Osada – US 6,066,916) taken with Na et al (Na – US 6,104,465). Fig. 4 of Osada shows the basic features of these claims. Thus, looking at Claim 1, and comparing it with Fig. 4, a substrate 1 for an electronic device is shown in which a plurality of conductive lines 2 are formed having a “straightly extended” portion 2c from their front ends and thereafter “bend by turns in substantially the same direction” at 2b

for connection to "connection targets" 2a. Osada, instead of the varying widths for the "straightly-extending portions" 2c to equalize the resistance values as recited in Claim 1, discloses a set of resistors 9 to perform this function (col. 5, line 5). Na is cited to show a functionally equivalent feature of the resistors of Osada. That is, Na shows in Fig.4 therein a panel with a plurality of interconnecting conductors L1-Ln to a display in which the interconnecting conductors vary in width to "produce uniform resistances" for the display (col. 4, line 1).

5. The Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007) has held that the simple substitution of one known, equivalent element for another to obtain predictable results is not patentable under 35 USC 103. Thus, here, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (with Osada and Na in front of him/her) to substitute the known equivalent element of using resistors (Osada) for equalizing the resistance values with the known functionally equivalent element of varying width conductors (Na) for equalizing the resistance values for conductors 2c in Osada, since predictable (and common) results of achieving equalized resistance values occurs. Claim 1 is therefore not patentable under 35 USC 103.

6. Regarding Claim 2, note driving circuitry 4 and 5 at the front ends of conductive lines 2 in Osada to meet this claim under 35 USC 103.

7. Regarding Claim 3, note target lines 2a are a plurality of parallel lines to render obvious this claim.

8. Regarding Claim 4, note the right angle bend between conductors 2c and 2b to meet this claim under 35 USC 103.

9. Regarding Claim 5, see Fig. 3 of Osada to show a display area A defined by opposing sides in which the straightly-extending portions are arranged in an area outside the display area as recited to thus render this claim obvious.
10. Regarding Claim 6, note that bus lines of the various figures in Osada are row electrode lines or gate electrode lines 2a to thus meet this claim under 35 USC 103.
11. Regarding Claim 7, note that display area A is also defined by third and fourth sides (top and bottom) opposed to each other and perpendicularly to the one or other sides, and a driving circuit 5 outside of the display area is adjacent to one of the third or fourth sides to thus render this claim obvious.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN HEYMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-5730. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 571- 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John Heyman/
Examiner, Art Unit 2871